

## FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

## <u>CERTIFIED MAIL</u> <u>RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED</u>

OCT 1 1 2016

J. Gerald Hebert Campaign Legal Center 1411 K St. NW, Suite 1400 Washington, DC 20005

RE:

MUR 6563

Dear Mr. Hebert:

This is in reference to the complaint you filed with the Federal Election Commission on April 30, 2012, alleging possible violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"). The Commission found that there was reason to believe Representative Aaron Schock violated 52 U.S.C. § 30125(e) of the Act. On October 6, 2016, the Commission accepted a conciliation agreement signed by the respondent and closed the file in this matter.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy, Disclosure of Certain Documents in Enforcement and Other Matters, 81 Fed. Reg. 50,702 (Aug. 2, 2016). A copy of the agreement with Representative Schock is enclosed for your information.

If you have any questions, please contact Tanya Senanayake, the attorney handling this matter, at (202) 694-1571.

Sincerely,

Lynn Y. Tran

**Assistant General Counsel** 

Enclosure
Conciliation Agreement

1 2	BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION		
3 4	In the Matter of ) MURs 6563 and 6733		
5 6	Representative Aaron Schock )		
7 8	CONCILIATION AGREEMENT		
9	These matters were initiated by signed, sworn, and notarized complaints by the Campaign		
10	Legal Center and Democracy 21 in MUR 6563 and by Eva Jehle in MUR 6733. The Federal		
11	Election Commission ("Commission") found reason to believe that Representative Aaron School		
12	("Respondent") violated 52 U.S.C. § 30125(e).		
13	NOW, THEREFORE, the Commission and the Respondent, having participated in		
14	informal methods of conciliation, prior to a finding of probable cause to believe, do hereby agree		
15	as follows:		
16	I. The Commission has jurisdiction over the Respondent and the subject matter of this		
17	proceeding, and this agreement has the effect of an agreement entered pursuant to 52 U.S.C.		
18	§ 30109(a)(4)(A)(i).		
19	II. Respondent has had a reasonable opportunity to demonstrate that no action should be		
20	taken in this matter.		
21	III. Respondent enters voluntarily into this agreement with the Commission.		
22	IV. The pertinent facts in this matter are as follows:		
23	1. Aaron Schock was a member of the U.S. House of Representatives from the		
24	18th Congressional District in Illinois and a candidate for reelection at the time of the events in		
25	this matter.		
26	2. The Campaign for Primary Accountability ("CPA"), an independent		
27	expenditure-only committee registered with the Commission, broadcast advertisements in		

MURs 6563 and 6733 (Representative Aaron Schock) Conciliation Agreement Page 2 of 5

- 1 support of Representative Adam Kinzinger in his primary election against Representative Don
- 2 Manzullo in the 16th Congressional District of Illinois on March 20, 2012.
- 3. Respondent, to raise funds for CPA to broadcast these advertisements, took the
- 4 following actions on or about March 14, 2012:
- 5 A. Respondent asked Representative Eric Cantor to contribute \$25,000 to
- 6 CPA. Respondent contends that he did so after he spoke with his counsel. Representative
- 7 Cantor's leadership PAC, Every Republican Is Crucial (ERICPAC), contributed \$25,000 to CPA
- 8 on March 15, 2012.
- B. It was alleged that Respondent asked the 18th District Republican
- 10 Central Committee Federal Account ("18th District Committee"), a local political party
- 11 committee in the 18th Congressional District in Illinois, to contribute \$25,000 to CPA. The 18th
- 12 District Committee contributed \$25,000 to CPA on March 16, 2012.
- 13 4. The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"), and
- 14 Commission regulations prohibit any federal candidate and any individual holding federal office
- 15 from soliciting funds in connection with an election for federal office unless the funds are subject
- to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of the Act. 52 U.S.C.
- 17 § 30125(e)(1)(A); 11 C.F.R. §§ 300.60, 300.61.
- 18 5. The Act limits contributions to non-authorized, non-party committees to
- 19 \$5,000 in any calendar year. 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(1)(C). This contribution limit does not apply
- 20 to contributions to independent expenditure-only committees under Citizens United v. FEC, 558
- 21 U.S. 310 (2010), and SpeechNow.org v. FEC, 599 F.3d 686 (D.C. Cir. 2010).
- 22 6. The Act's solicitation restrictions under 52 U.S.C. § 30125(e)(1)(A) remain
- 23 applicable to federal candidates and individuals holding federal office soliciting contributions

MURs 6563	and 6733 (Representative Aaron Schock)
Conciliation	
Page 3 of 5	

- 1 from individuals and federal PACs. See Advisory Opinion 2011-12 (Majority PAC).
- 2 Accordingly, federal candidates and individuals holding federal office may not solicit
- 3 contributions in excess of \$5,000 from individuals and federal PACs to non-authorized, non-
- 4 party committees in connection with an election for federal office. See 52 U.S.C. §§ 30125(e),
- 5 30116(a).

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

7. The Commission defines "to solicit" to mean:

to ask, request, or recommend, explicitly or implicitly, that another person make a contribution, donation, transfer of funds, or otherwise provide anything of value. A solicitation is an oral or written communication that, construed as reasonably understood in the context in which it is made, contains a clear message asking, requesting, or recommending that another person make a contribution, donation, transfer of funds, or otherwise provide anything of value. A solicitation may be made directly or indirectly. The context includes the conduct of persons involved in the communication. A solicitation does not include mere statements of political support or mere guidance as to the applicability of a particular law or regulation.

16 17 18

11 C.F.R. § 300.2(m).

- 19 V. 1. Respondent solicited a \$25,000 contribution from Representative Cantor to
- 20 CPA. Respondent violated 52 U.S.C. § 30125(e) by soliciting a contribution in excess of the
- 21 \$5,000 statutory limit.
- 22 2. In order to avoid the delay and expense of litigation, Respondent does not
- admit but no longer contests that Respondent violated 52 U.S.C. § 30125(e) by soliciting a
- 24 contribution from the 18th District Committee to CPA in excess of the \$5,000 statutory limit.
- 3. The Commission did not find reason to believe that Respondent's violation of
- 26 the Act was knowing or willful.
- VI. 1. Respondent will pay a civil penalty to the Commission in the amount of Ten
- 28 Thousand Dollars (\$10,000), pursuant to 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(5)(A).

MURs 6563 and 6733 (Representative Aaron Schock) Conciliation Agreement Page 4 of 5

1	2. Respondent will cease and desist in committing violations of 52 U.S.C.	
2	§ 30125(e).	
3	VII. The Commission, on request of anyone filing a complaint under	
4	52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(1) concerning the matters at issue herein or on its own motion, may review	
5	compliance with this agreement. If the Commission believes that this agreement or any	
6	requirement thereof has been violated, it may institute a civil action for relief in the United States	
7 .	District Court for the District of Columbia.	
8	VIII. This agreement shall become effective as of the date that all parties hereto have	
9	executed same and the Commission has approved the entire agreement.	
10	IX. Respondent shall have no more than 30 days from the date this agreement becomes	
11	effective to comply with and implement the requirements contained in this agreement and to so	
12	notify the Commission.	
13	X. This Conciliation Agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the parties on	
14	the matters raised herein, and no other statement, promise, or agreement, either written or oral,	
15	made by either party or by agents of either party, that is not contained within this written	
16	agreement shall be enforceable.	
17	FOR THE COMMISSION:	
18 19 20	Kathleen Guith  10-11-16  Date	
21 22	Acting Associate General Counsel for Enforcement	
LL	ioi emoicement	

MURs 6563 and 6733 (Representative Aaron Schock) Conciliation Agreement Page 5 of 5

I FOR THE RESPONDENT:

2 Fliot S. Berke

4 Counsel for Respondent

1114

Date